

REMARKS

Claims 64-75, 77-87, 89-91, 95-106, 110-114, 116-119 and 121-126 have been amended.

Regarding the rejections based upon double patenting, applicant will timely file a terminal disclaimer. However, as all of the claims are not subject to the rejection, it is requested that the need to file a terminal rejection be held in abeyance pending a final determination of the allowable claims, at which time a terminal disclaimer will be filed in respect of all allowed claims that are subject to the rejection.

In response to the two rejections under 35 USC § 112, the claims have been amended, where appropriate, to change the recitation of "greater than about 2000 fpm" to "greater than about 2400 fpm" and to recite that the "moving surface" is a "surface of a web moving in a given direction". In view of such amendments, it is requested that these rejections have been overcome and that they be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection under 35 USC § 102 based upon Isayama et al. 4,499,199, all of the claims, including all of the independent claims, have been amended in a manner to clearly distinguish over the reference. In particular:

Independent claim 64 has been amended to recite the step of "introducing coating liquid under pressure onto a concave curves surface...", which clearly is not the case in Isayama et al., in which coating liquid flows solely under the influence of gravity, and not under any pressure whatever, along a gently sloping slide surface to and over a curved surface to and then along a curved surface 9. This recitation is not

new matter and is found in the parent application of which the present application is a continuation, for example at column 8, lines 32-37 of patent 6,592,669, which issued from the parent application.

Independent claim 81 has been amended to set forth the step of "doctoring the coating liquid on the web surface". The doctoring feature is not found in Isayama et al., as is appreciated by the examiner, since various ones of the dependent claims that called for the "doctoring" step, for example dependent claim 84 prior to amendment, have not been rejected over the Isayama et al. reference.

Independent claim 98 has been amended to call for flowing coating liquid along a "bounded" concave curved surface. Isayama does not teach flowing coating along a bounded concave curved surface, but instead the curved surface in Isayama et al. is unbounded. This distinguishing feature has also been appreciated by the examiner, since various ones of the dependent claims that called for the curved surface to be "bounded", for example dependent claim 103, have not been rejected over Isayama et al..

Independent claim 113 has been amended to call for the coating liquid flow path to include "a generally straight section immediately upstream from at least one portion of the flow path that changes in direction in one direction only" and leads to a terminal portion of the flow path. This is not the case in Isayama et al. in which the slide surface, which appears to somewhat straight, is immediately upstream from a portion of the

Application No. 10/615,627
Amendment Dated July 13, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 13, 2005

flow path that first changes in one direction along an intersection line 10 and then changes in an opposite direction along the groove 9.

All of independent claims 64, 81, 98 and 113 therefore distinguish and are allowable over the reference to Isayama et al., the only reference cited in a rejection of the claims, so it is respectfully submitted that those claims, along with their associated dependent claims, are allowable.

In view of the foregoing and as all of the claims now appear to be allowable, favorable reconsideration and early passage of the application to allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Lloyd, Reg. No. 25,694
Pyle & Piontek
221 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 850 Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 236-8123